



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY.

---

### OUR TWO GREAT PARTIES: THEIR ORIGIN AND TASKS.

#### I. THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

NOTHING is more false than the cynicism, uttered often of late, that the end for which parties exist is the power and patronage of office. It is true that this is the end of the "party boss" and the "party machine," but it is not the end of parties themselves. Every legitimate party—and one may add that every great and durable party is legitimate—comes into being in order to do a particular work in the service of the state. Parties are born of public wants. It is with the state as with other organisms; its development waits on the satisfaction of its new wants. When in the course of this development a want appears for which the policy of the government and the policies of existing parties do not provide, then, in order to procure for it the satisfaction which cannot be found elsewhere, those citizens to whom this want appeals most strongly organize as a political party. To provide satisfaction for the particular public want which calls it into existence is the proper work of every party—the task assigned it by its master, the state. The success of a party depends on the clearness with which it perceives and on the fidelity with which it executes its allotted task. A just idea of this task is essential to every one who would be a good citizen. With this idea before him, he knows what the policy of his party should be, and he is able to do his share in securing its adoption and observance; without this idea, he is at the mercy of associates whose aim is to use

party for the advancement of their own personal fortunes. Scarcely less important is a true conception of the tasks of parties other than one's own ; for it enables each one to judge with fairness the conduct of all and to occupy a standpoint sufficiently elevated to command the entire political field. But the best way to ascertain with precision what are the tasks, both general and specific, of any given party, is through a study of its origin. It is when it is first received, that a commission is most legible.

### 1. *Origin of the Democratic Party.*

This, the older of the two great parties of the present, was organized on a national basis within the first five years after the inauguration of Washington. The situation at that time was as follows : The state parties which had led the way hitherto in the treatment of public questions could do so no longer. With the establishment of the new constitution the centre of political interest had shifted ; national concerns were now uppermost and were destined to remain so. But national parties had not as yet come into existence. The struggle over ratification which began in 1787 had taken the form of a series of state campaigns, in which each commonwealth decided for itself the matter at issue. Nevertheless there were certain features of the contest which prepared the way for the approaching consolidation of local into national parties. The questions debated were everywhere the same. From New Hampshire to Georgia, identical or very similar arguments were urged for and against the new plan. The leaders, and in particular those who were friendly to the proposed change, did not confine their efforts to their own states. In all of the commonwealths the influence of Washington was felt ; in many of them the same was true of Madison and Hamilton, and, on the other side, of Henry and Lee. This hearty co-operation of political leaders belonging to the different states was a long step towards the union of their followers in national party organizations. But the event which finally effected this union and made it durable was the adoption of a definite and strongly national policy by the new federal government.

This policy, devised in the main by Hamilton, but receiving the cordial and earnest support of Washington, ran in important respects counter to the predilections of the majority of the American people. In the first place, its manifest and indeed avowed tendency to nationalize the Union offended those who still believed in the sovereignty of the individual states. In the second place, the energetic use which the government made of powers like that of imposing excises, which, although denied to its predecessor, were explicitly conferred by the new constitution, alarmed those who were averse to strong government and in particular to a strong central government. The bold appropriation of other highly important powers, such as that of creating a bank, on the ground that they were conferred by implication — a principle which seemed of indefinite extensibility — had a like and even greater effect. Again, the financial policy of Hamilton, although it restored public credit and gave a healthful stimulus to general industry, was obnoxious to many because it established an alliance between the government and the owners and managers of capital, and thus threatened to bring into politics the corrupting influence of the “money power.” To others this policy was objectionable because they thought that it sacrificed the interests of the South, where “the debt was owed,” to those of the North, where “it was owned.” In the fourth place, when the government at the beginning of the struggle in Europe declared for strict neutrality and made earnest endeavors to compose the old and irritating differences with England, its course was altogether unpopular. France the people loved and wished to help; England they hated and wished to humble. Finally, the moderately but distinctly aristocratic tone of the administration brought it into collision with the social movement of the time, which was increasingly democratic, and, what was of greater immediate importance, gave color to the charge, made repeatedly by Jefferson and his friends, that those in control of the government were at heart traitors to republicanism, and were secretly plotting its overthrow and the reintroduction of monarchy. We have, it is true, convincing proof that the accusa-

tion was false; but it was honestly made, was widely believed and had very great influence. One noteworthy result was that it led the opposition to pose as defenders-in-chief of the constitution against those who had taken the leading part in framing it and in securing its adoption. Despite its untruth and injustice, the delusion in respect to the anti-republican spirit and purposes of the Federalists was useful in repressing revolutionary tendencies, and in developing loyalty to the new system among those who at first regarded it with suspicion if not enmity.

It was during the five years beginning with 1789 that the government, in a series of remarkable measures, defined its policy in reference to the matters named above, and that the different classes of citizens whom it offended began, with little regard to state or sectional lines, to draw together and to act with a common purpose. At first the opposition was prompted more by instinct than by calculation, and was both irregular and ineffective; but before the end of 1793, under the leadership of Jefferson and the discipline of repeated contests over definite issues, it became organized as a durable and formidable party.<sup>1</sup> But organization does not provide the material of which a new party is composed; it can only bring together material already in existence. Hence the real beginnings of a party must be sought for, not in the few months or years during which its organization is effected, but in a greatly extended earlier period. They are to be found only in the slow growth

<sup>1</sup> In a letter written to Washington, dated May 23, 1792, Jefferson summarizes his objections to the policy of the government. In the arraignment of the funding scheme and associated measures he asserts, under the form of reporting the views of others: "That all the capital employed in paper speculation is barren and useless, producing, like that on a gaming table, no accession to itself, and is withdrawn from commerce and agriculture where it would have produced addition to the common mass: that it nourishes in our citizens habits of vice and idleness, instead of industry and morality: that it has furnished effectual means of corrupting such a portion of the legislature as turns the balance between the honest voters whichever way it is directed: that this corrupt squadron, deciding the voice of the legislature, have manifested their dispositions to get rid of the limitations imposed by the constitution on the general legislature, limitations on the faith of which the states acceded to that instrument: that the ultimate object of all this is to prepare the way for a change from the present republican form of government to that of a monarchy, of which the English constitution is to be the model." Jefferson's Works, III, 359.

of ideas and convictions which are the foundation of political character, and as such determine the attitude of citizens toward public questions. There must have been Democrats before there could be a Democratic party; and the beginnings of the party are to be traced in the processes which developed in citizens the spirit and purposes of democracy.

We have seen that antagonism to the centralizing and conservative policy of the early federal administrations was the immediate motive that led to the formation of the first Republican, or as we now term it, Democratic party. But this antagonism itself was the fruit of the progress of many centuries. Indeed it is not too much to say that to its growth every influence ministered which worked for the establishment of two ideas: first, that citizens should have equal civil and political rights; second, that government should be under the control and in the service, not of privileged classes, nor of favored individuals, but of the people. Looking simply at the field of American history, it would be just to enumerate among the causes of the origin of the Democratic party all influences which from the beginning of the colonial period carried forward at a really marvelous rate the democratization of American character. Of these it will suffice to mention three: first, that sifting process by which the persecutors of the old world sent to the leading colonies of the new those of their subjects who were most democratically inclined,—the men who, although not yet ready to concede freedom to others, were most resolute in asserting it for themselves; second, the protracted and severe but altogether wholesome discipline, economic, social, military and political, through which in the course of somewhat more than a century and a half the colonists grew into fitness for self-government; and lastly, the revolution itself, which was a social as well as a political uprising. We habitually think of this movement as one whose primary if not sole aim was to throw off British authority in order to establish American home rule. But it was also a modern and highly important phase of the ancient struggle between aristocracy and democracy. In fact the deepest cause and the most complete justification of the revolution are to be

found in the circumstance that in the progress towards democracy which both were making, the American people had far outstripped their British kinsfolk. In 1765 the former had become democratic, while the latter were, comparatively speaking, still aristocratic. The public policy therefore which most truly expressed the political character of the English and was best adapted to serve their interests, did not truly express American political character and could not satisfactorily serve American interests. This view goes far to explain the unity which at the beginning of the struggle was so quickly and completely established between the hitherto unfriendly thirteen commonwealths.<sup>1</sup> It goes far to explain, in the second place, why the northernmost British dominions could not be induced to take part in the movement. They had scarcely entered on the pathway of democratic progress. The grievances which their southern neighbors felt because the British policy was anti-democratic, were to them unintelligible. It explains, too, while it does not justify, the extent, the rigor and at times the inhumanity of the crusade against the Tories. They were hated not simply as loyalists, but as aristocrats, whose policy was the restoration of the aristocratic system of England. It explains, lastly, that swift advance of the democratic spirit between 1765 and 1786, which is perhaps the most noteworthy feature of legislation and social history. But the achievement of independence and the suppression of the Tories gave to American democracy a stronger stimulus than it could bear. In most of the states shameful excesses marked the years just after the war. Democracy fell into general discredit.<sup>2</sup> In the reaction which followed, the conserva-

<sup>1</sup> It is the custom of those who look at the matter from the standpoint of the present situation to wonder that the states during and immediately after the revolution should have been so loosely and imperfectly united; but looking at the matter from the historical standpoint and keeping in mind with what reluctance every political unity submits to incorporation with others in a larger unity, we ought rather to wonder at the quickness with which the Union was formed, and at the elements of strength and durability which it possessed. It was the leaven of democracy in them all which made this possible.

<sup>2</sup> In the convention of 1787, Gerry, afterwards one of the foremost of Democratic leaders, said: "The evils which we experience flow from the excess of democracy." Elliot's Debates, V, 136. At the close of the convention, in giving reasons for not

tive elements made good use of their opportunity. The constitution of 1787—the excellent and abiding fruit of this reaction—was framed, its adoption after a doubtful struggle was secured, and the new federal government was successfully inaugurated. But the body of the people remained democratic. And soon, as has been shown above, alarm at the undemocratic character which the federal policy assumed, and sympathy with the revolution in France led to the revival of American democracy and to the formation of the national Democratic party.

## 2. *The Tasks of the Democratic Party.*

The circumstances of its origin show that the Democratic party began its career as the party of the masses. “The cherishment of the people,” to use the quaint phrase of Jefferson, “was its principle.” To advance their welfare—so far as this can be done by political means—was and is its proper work. Stated in its most general form, the task of the new party was to renew and carry forward on a national scale that democratic movement which, until the conservative reaction of 1787, had been the dominant feature of American political development. But what in its nature and aims is the democratic movement? Upon the answer much depends. The ideas respecting democracy—using that term in its broadest sense—which are held by those to whom the management of its interests is committed, determine both the quality of their leadership and, temporarily at least, the character of its fortunes. Historically the progress of a people begins with one or a few of its representatives. For a time, rightly and necessarily, the enjoyment of the “higher goods” of life which embody this progress is confined to the few. But where public conditions are healthful and progress is

signing the constitution, Gerry, having in mind the recent experiences of Massachusetts, spoke of democracy as “the worst of political evils.” *Ibid.* 557. Randolph, afterwards the ally of Jefferson in Washington’s cabinet, said: “In tracing these evils [those under which the United States labored] to their source, every man had found it in the turbulence and follies of democracy.” *Ibid.* 138. And even Mason, the staunchest of Democrats, who thought that the new government must end either in monarchy or a tyrannical aristocracy, conceded “the injustice and oppression experienced among us from democracy.” *Ibid.* 154.



normal, participation in these "higher goods" soon begins to widen, and this process goes on until at last the humblest citizen becomes to the full measure of his capacity a sharer in them. This diffusion of the "higher" and the "highest goods" of civilization, first within national limits and then universally, is the aim of the democratic movement. In its employ are many agencies. Among the most useful of these are religious and philanthropic organizations; but the one to which the political direction of the movement falls is the Democratic party. The importance of this trust becomes clear when we reflect that the policy of the state towards the movement is the factor which decides the question of success or failure. This policy can be made to take a form which will bring it to an end long before the people have obtained any considerable portion of the "higher goods" which it undertakes to carry to them. How numerous and impressive are the illustrations of the premature arrest of the democratic movement which the history of Asia furnishes! On the other hand the policy of the state can be shaped in such a way as to promote the full, healthful and beneficent development of the movement. To cause it to take and maintain this favorable form is the proper aim of the Democratic party. Its efforts to this end, namely that of securing through political means the participation of the masses in the "higher goods" of civilization, may be roughly grouped in three divisions: first, those which seek to extend and equalize political and civil rights; second, those which seek to protect in the possession and enjoyment of rights; third, those which seek to develop and maintain in the masses that quality of citizenship which makes the wide diffusion of political privileges an advantage both to the citizen and to the state. In the policy of the party, so far as that policy has been truly democratic, these points have always been cardinal; and such they must continue until each is accomplished.

At the beginning of the party's career the duty to educate the citizen was less clearly perceived than its correlatives — the duty to extend his privileges, and the duty to protect him in the possession and enjoyment of these. For this there is a

sufficient explanation. Without the aid of party the people had already attained to a degree of political capacity which required for its proper exercise a larger participation in government. Hence the earliest work of democratic organizations, both in colonial days and at the beginning of the national period, was not to produce capacity—influences outside of their control were doing that—but to secure room for the exercise of capacity already produced. When the national party was formed a century ago, the movement to make political privilege commensurate with political capacity was under full headway. The state democracies had already achieved notable progress in the disestablishment of privileged classes and institutions, and in the extension of the franchise. In this work the national party could not take a direct share; for the constitution of the United States had left the control of the franchise and of property rights to the states. It cannot be doubted, however, that the influence of the national party, and especially of its stronger leaders, hastened the democratization of the constitutions and laws of the states. Despite certain reactionary influences the process went on until, before the middle of the nineteenth century was reached, equality of civil and political rights had become, with inconsiderable exceptions, the rule throughout the free-labor portion of the Union. This task is now accomplished. A political equality more comprehensive than the party first contemplated is to-day the fundamental law both of the states and of the nation.<sup>1</sup> But the task of extending political rights involved more than the granting of the franchise. In the early stages of the democratic movement the laws and the traditions of government were unfavorable to the masses. Both had come into existence and both had received the sanction of ancient usage long before the common people had become a distinct and powerful factor in politics. It was necessary therefore to change law and tradition so as to give to each a thoroughly democratic character. This, a slow and difficult work, is now

<sup>1</sup> The Democratic party has not done this alone. The most extraordinary extension of the suffrage was the enfranchisement of the freedmen by the Republican party.

also substantially accomplished. To-day, in spirit and in form our laws, our government, our institutions are democratic.

The second of the greater tasks of the Democratic party, namely, the protection of the citizen in the possession and enjoyment of his lawful rights, is one which from its very nature can never be fully accomplished. To quite an extent the opposition to the constitution and the demand that if accepted it should be amended so as to incorporate a Bill of Rights, may be looked upon as democratic efforts in defence of the rights of the individual. The same is true of the antagonism kindled by the centralizing policy of the Federalist administrations. In this, as has been shown above, the Democrats believed that the seeds of a new tyranny were germinating. In the Alien and Sedition Laws they thought that they saw the realization of their worst fears. They regarded both as harshly oppressive, and the Sedition Law as clearly unconstitutional. Years afterwards, when Jefferson was seeking to repair the broken friendship with the Adams family, he wrote Mrs. John Adams in explanation of the pardon of Callender—who, because of disrespectful utterances towards her husband, had been sentenced under this law to a term in prison—that he considered that law as unconstitutional and a nullity as “absolute and palpable as if Congress had ordered us to fall down and worship a graven image.” But in the presence of these laws, what were the Democrats to do? The government was against them in every branch. The situation seemed desperate. What they did do was to formulate the celebrated Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 and 1799. The part which these resolutions afterwards played in the service of sectionalism both North and South has done much to obscure their real character. They were not in any sense a product of the sectional spirit. They were promulgated, not in the interest of any division of the Union, but in the interest of the liberties of the people everywhere,—in the interest of Matthew Lyon of Vermont quite as much as in that of any citizen of South Carolina. The theory of the Union which they propounded is, I believe, a mistaken one. But it would have argued ill for the

future of the Democratic party and of the American people, if the acts arraigned by the resolutions had been suffered to pass without earnest protest.

Resistance to those early measures of the federal government which were deemed oppressive developed into a settled policy of resistance to centralization. It was held that a powerful central government which rested on popular favor and possessed a full treasury must become corrupt and tyrannical. The individual citizen would not be able to control it and would not feel responsible for it; but he could share in its favors and would learn to lean upon it. Hence it became early a well-established principle of Democratic party policy to keep the federal government weak and poor. But this was not solely for the sake of the individual. It was believed that the federal government could be used by one class or section to oppress other classes or sections, and that its capacity for evil in these directions would be proportioned to its powers and to the wealth which it controlled. To a considerable degree Democratic opposition to protective tariffs has been based on this principle. One unmistakable result of such tariffs is to increase the dependence of the citizen upon government, and to enlarge the resources of government for controlling the citizen through means which appeal to self-interest. Moreover the strongest arguments of its friends have never been able to convince Democrats that the burdens and benefits of protection can be shared by different sections and classes in equal measure; but that they ought to be shared in this way, is fundamental in the Democratic code.

In earlier days the national government was looked upon as the most formidable, if not the only, source of danger to the rights which the Democratic party undertook to guard; but now other sources are revealing themselves. The states used to be considered the strongest and most trustworthy guardians of popular rights. It was this belief, as shown above, which led the Democratic party to accept the doctrine of state-rights in the extreme form set forth in the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions. But how are the states discharging this trust? Their

legislatures have undergone a marked deterioration.<sup>1</sup> In many of them a majority of the members possess few or none of the qualifications which fit men for that high and most difficult of public functions, namely, the making of good laws. The consequence is that the state governments have already become the oppressors of the people; and the prospect is that they will go on from bad to worse. To this we have decisive testimony in the fact that the people everywhere are seeking both by restrictive provisions and by direct popular legislation to place their legislatures under greater constitutional restraints.<sup>2</sup> Into the causes of the unhappy change we cannot now inquire; but it is clear that if the Democratic party would protect the people in their rights, it must turn its attention to the governments of the states quite as much as to that of the Union. In general the same may be said of municipal government. This is seen at its worst in the large city. Here the democratic theory as held by extremists—with whom fortunately the greater leaders of American democracy are never to be classed—would lead us to expect a political paradise. What we have, as the world knows, is something quite different. Nowhere else in civilized lands are the most sacred rights of the citizen trampled under foot in so swinish a manner. Here therefore the Democratic party, the party of the masses, has an urgent duty to perform. Another of the newer sources of oppression is party. To break, in the interests of free and responsible citizenship, the despotism which party, or rather the party machine, has established, is a task which belongs indeed to all parties, but especially to that one which proclaims that resistance to oppression is the highest of political duties. But of this more below.

In performing the first of its greater tasks, namely, that of securing to the masses the right to share in political functions, the Democratic party was engaged for a long time in work which in good part was destructive. Before it could properly

<sup>1</sup> See Bryce, *American Commonwealth*, chapter xl.

<sup>2</sup> The decay of state government, and of the state (commonwealth) itself as a factor in the American political system, has been conclusively established by Professor J. W. Burgess. See *POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY*, I, 9 (March, 1886).

lay the foundations of the new system, it had to break down and clear away the supports of the earlier antagonistic system. For a considerable period, therefore, its attitude towards existing law was that of hostility. This was necessary and highly useful; but it had at least one evil result: it weakened in the people that wholesome sentiment of respect for law which is one of the strongest supports of public order and of individual morality. In performing the second task, namely that of protecting the people in the possession and enjoyment of their newly acquired rights, it needs to cultivate again the law-abiding spirit; otherwise its work cannot endure. The laws, the institutions and the general system which the democracy has been laboriously building up will have need of defence. Already they are being attacked from two sides, the reactionary aristocratic and the socialistic. But in order that the party may defend law it must respect law; and before it can respect law it must produce law that is worthy of respect.

The third task, that of political education, is the one to which the party has given least attention. One reason for this is the unfortunate prevalence of what may be called the theory of natural political equality. This began to find favor about the middle of the last century and was widely accepted at the time of the American and the French revolutions. It affirms that there is, in justice, no such thing as political privilege, that full and equal participation in government is the natural right of every citizen. If this theory is true, the sole aim of a party devoted to the masses should be to secure for them what nature intended but men had denied. There were some, however, who insisted long ago that education was essential to the success of democratic institutions. Among these was Jefferson. Aside from his strenuous warfare upon privilege, there is perhaps no feature of his conduct so noteworthy as his zeal and efforts in the cause of education. "If a nation," he wrote in 1816, "expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."<sup>1</sup>

It must be evident to every one who studies carefully the dif-

<sup>1</sup> Works, VI, 517.

ferent forms of government (national, state, municipal) in the United States, that one prolific source of their imperfections is the possession of the ballot by multitudes, both North and South, who are not yet qualified to use it rightly. In the cities and to a considerable extent in the states at large, the cause of good government has been sacrificed to the too early realization of the democratic ideal of general and equal suffrage. But the American people, in whom the sense of the practical is strongly developed, will not always submit to bad government for the sake of a political ideal. In order to guard against a reaction even more strongly anti-democratic than that of 1787, the Democratic party should see to it that the quality of the citizenship of the masses is raised. Its own welfare as well as that of the country demands this. But how shall the result be accomplished? In the first place it should cherish, maintain and perfect the two most important sources of political education, namely the schools and local self-government. In its school policy it should give a prominent place to those studies which are calculated to promote good citizenship. It should not be content with primary schools, nor with a system that unites primary and secondary schools, but by founding institutions and by establishing generous scholarships and fellowships it should aim to place the higher and the highest education within the reach of the most capable and aspiring sons and daughters of the poor.<sup>1</sup>

Of not less importance than the schools in the political education of the people is local self-government. The growth of the capacity of the citizen for the service of the state depends on the degree of his interest in public questions, and on the extent of his responsibility for their right treatment. Local self-government in its various forms — state, county, township, parish, ward, district — brings the citizen face to face with public questions concerning which he is well-informed, which visibly

<sup>1</sup> Jefferson's plan for the educational system of Virginia provided for secondary schools and a university as well as primary schools. He was the father of the University of Virginia, an institution which holds an enviable place among the best of those which are devoted to higher learning in America. See Professor H. B. Adams' excellent monograph, *Thomas Jefferson and the University of Virginia*.

affect his own interests and the interests of his neighbors, and in the settlement of which his voice and influence may count for much. Indeed so important a factor in the training of the citizen is local self-government, that we may well question whether any people destitute of it can ever be practically self-governing. Jefferson's estimate of its value, given in old age, is impressive :

It is by dividing and subdividing these republics, from the great national one down through all its subordinations, until it ends in the administration of every man's farm by himself — by placing under every one what his own eye may superintend, that all will be done for the best. What has destroyed liberty and the rights of man in every government which has ever existed under the sun? The generalizing and concentrating all cares and powers into one body, no matter whether of the autocrats of Russia or France, or of the aristocrats of a Venetian senate. And I do believe that if the Almighty has not decreed that man shall never be free, (and it is a blasphemy to believe it) that [*sic*] the secret will be found to be in the making himself the depository of the powers respecting himself, so far as he is competent to them, and delegating only what is beyond his competence, by a synthetical process, to higher and higher orders of functionaries, so as to trust fewer and fewer powers in proportion as the trustees become more and more oligarchical. The elementary republics of the wards, the county republics, the state republics and the republic of the Union would form a gradation of authorities, standing each on the basis of law, holding every one its delegated share of powers, and constituting truly a system of fundamental balances and checks for the government. Where every man is a sharer in the direction of his ward-republic or of some of the higher ones, and feels that he is a participator in the government of affairs, not merely at an election one day in the year, but every day ; when there shall not be a man in the state who will not be a member of some one of its councils, great or small ; he will let the heart be torn out of his body sooner than his power be wrested from him by a Cæsar or a Bonaparte. How powerfully did we feel the energy of this organization in the case of embargo? I felt the foundation of the government shaken under my feet by the New England townships.<sup>1</sup>

The institutions of local self-government were planted long before the national Democratic party came into being, but it was to do good service in maintaining them, especially in the state form. It is true that for a considerable period entanglement

<sup>1</sup> Works, VI, 543.



with slavery influenced its conduct in this respect ; but long before slavery became a prominent issue, the Democratic party was the champion of the states, and it is their champion still.

The newspaper press is at the present day a useful and powerful means of popular education. Its influence over the masses is particularly strong ; but they need from it a higher quality of service than they are now receiving. They need a press not less enterprising, nor less studious to please healthful tastes, than that of the present, but they need one which shall give less space to the brutish doings of mankind, and more to the activities which make for progress.

But the ways in which party exerts the most direct, if not the most powerful, influence upon the quality of citizenship are two : first, through the spirit and methods of party management ; second, through the character of the different forms of government which party controls, and for which, therefore, party is responsible. It can hardly be doubted that the great body of the people receives a very large and possibly the larger share of political education at the hands of party. For the citizen who is merely a voter, party names the candidate and the measures that he supports ; for the citizen who desires preferment, party is the only road to political office ; for the citizen who would serve the state, party furnishes the readiest and most effective means. Hence since the people do their political work under the direction of party, party becomes a potent factor in shaping political character. In fact parties and party leaders do for adults very much what schools and teachers do for youth. The standard of public service, the spirit and the methods which prevail in a party, tend to reproduce themselves in all its followers. Any party, therefore, which entrusts the management of its interests, state or national, to men who are bad citizens, and countenances these in the employment of methods which are dishonorable and demoralizing, is sapping the foundations of citizenship. In this way it can do more to destroy, than local self-government, the public-school system and the newspaper press can do to build up, the qualities which make good citizens. Of what use, for example, is local self-government — which is of value mainly

because it trains the individual to independent thought and action in respect to public affairs — if rings and bosses usurp within the local sphere the functions which belong to the citizen? Apparently the greatest failure of the American party system in its present stage of development is that the methods and management of the stronger parties are calculated to depress rather than to raise the quality of citizenship of their followers. We must concede in this point the superiority of the English system.

The second way in which parties influence citizenship, namely through the character of the different forms of government which they control, is likewise of the first importance. The motive of government should be to advance as much as possible public welfare; its personnel should include the best citizens, and none but good ones; its methods should be the most effective within the range of its choice, and at the same time they should conform to the highest standards of morals and decorum. In so far as governments meet these requirements they set before the citizen, in a way which is both attractive and impressive, a model of what he should strive to be and to do. Their influence, exerted constantly and powerfully, tends to develop the best elements of civic character. In so far, on the other hand, as governments depart from these requirements, their influence is for harm. Instead of confirming they weaken what is good; instead of rebuking they encourage what is evil. But under the existing system, governments, national, state and municipal, are in the service and under the control of party. If, therefore, the Democratic party would succeed in what has been described as the greatest and most difficult of its present tasks, namely, to develop and maintain a high quality of citizenship in those who in a special sense are under its charge, it needs to become everywhere, in city and state as well as at Washington, the strenuous and consistent champion of good government.

What is the bearing of these general tasks upon the policy of the party towards the leading public issues of the present day? Here there is room for disagreement; but in the judgment of the writer it may be stated briefly as follows :

The party policy should continue to be anti-sectional. From the beginning one of the most difficult and costly, but at the same time one of the most useful of its services, was to assist in holding together the discordant sections until the northern — by far the more democratic of the two — should become strong enough to maintain the Union by force. Of the different bonds which united North and South, the Democratic party was the strongest, and was the last to break. In performing this service it sacrificed consistency, and for a time was untrue to fundamental principles. But it did this, we must in all fairness concede, not so much in the service of slavery as in that of the Union. To-day its duty towards the sections is of a less compromising nature. The present task, that of reconciliation, while involving no betrayal of principle, does tend to broader sympathies and a more healthful political character.

In the early days it was difficult to adjust rightly the relations of American democracy to the French variety, which displayed such strongly marked socialistic and centralizing tendencies. It was important that sympathy and friendship should subsist between the two systems; it was more important that the democracy of the United States should not come under the control of that of France. To-day this danger has passed away. American democracy is too large a thing to be swerved from its course by outside influence. But a new embarrassment has now arisen. How shall the Democratic party deal with the socialistic and centralizing tendencies of its own adherents? It is dangerous to ignore these tendencies, for they are strongly established, and there may be in them an element of reasonableness. On the other hand it is clear that socialism is incompatible with the distinctive principle of American democracy. Socialists and democrats have at heart the same interest, namely the welfare of the masses; but their methods are diametrically opposed. The socialist depends upon the community or the state, the democrat upon himself. Neither can accept the principle of the other without surrendering his own. Viewed from the democratic standpoint, the introduction of the social-

istic régime would mean the destruction of the most valuable elements of political character.

As the champion of the masses, the Democratic party gave early a welcome to the immigrant and advocated a short term for naturalization. Without question some evils resulted ; nevertheless this policy is now accepted by the rival party. The advantage of the policy is that speedy admission to the rights of citizenship hastens the process of Americanization. In the Federalist period the immigrant would have fared ill if the Democratic party had not received him and begun his political training. To-day the welcome which both parties extend to him does something to keep the immigrant from swelling the ranks of the dangerous classes. One of the things which a modern civilized country cannot afford is a multitude of inhabitants who are not citizens. There is, however, ground for thinking that the Democratic party should now modify its traditional policy with respect to immigration. It is having more than enough to do in discharging its duties towards its American constituency ; to enlarge and at the same time to debase this constituency by encouraging the influx of intractable foreigners, is to say the least imprudent. Adherents who cannot be easily Americanized are a source of weakness rather than of strength to the party.

The tariff policy of the Democratic party is calculated to foster good citizenship. Whatever may be thought of the claim that a lower tariff will conduce not only to a more rapid increase of national wealth but also to its more equal and just distribution, it will be conceded that freer trade with other peoples must in certain ways exert a favorable influence upon character. It excludes that traffic between party and government on the one side, and protected interests on the other, which is a marked and injurious feature of high protection. It excludes also that ignoble form of extreme nationalism which is not ashamed to claim as a recommendation of the protective policy that it enables us, the richest and most prosperous people of the world, to compel our "poor relations" in Europe to pay

a very considerable percentage of our taxes. In seeking to free every class and section from paying tribute to any other class or section, it defers to and fosters a sentiment of justice. In seeking to wean the American producer from an enervating dependence on government, it builds up again that element of character which is the secret of American success, namely, self-reliance.

The favor which a large section of the party extends to the scheme for the free coinage of silver is inconsistent with democratic principles as well as with the best democratic traditions. In so far as the motive for free coinage is to enhance the price of silver, it appeals only to those who hold the anti-democratic doctrine that for certain classes of producers government ought to provide profitable markets at the cost of the general public. In so far as the object is, through cheapening the money unit, to discharge debts by the payment of less value than was understood at the time when the debts were incurred, the result must be to injure the character of those who seek to profit by repudiation, and of the party which consents to become their advocate. It was acts based upon motives such as this which, soon after the revolution, brought the state democracies into lasting discredit, and gave to the party of Hamilton rather than that of Jefferson the control of the government during the Federalist period.

Lastly, because its membership includes tens of thousands over whom employers can exert undue influence, and other tens of thousands to whom the vote-buyer has an access all too easy, the Democratic party is vitally interested in the establishment of the secret ballot. Rightly estimated, measures which save the citizen from casting a truckling or venal ballot do him and the country a greater service than measures which raise his wages or lessen for him the cost of living.

In general it may be said of each feature of Democratic policy that it is right and profitable in so far—and only in so far—as it helps the party to accomplish its tasks as the protector and educator of the masses.

ANSON D. MORSE.